

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching as taught by Kulakowski, et al. into Birch, et al.'s system in order to provide flexible data compression-decompression controls that enable randomly accessing compressed data through relatively simple accessing mechanisms.

The remaining claims were also rejected citing in combination with the first two references Harney, et al. in rejecting Claims 2 and 9 and Purcell, et al. in rejecting Claims 6, 7 and 13-15.

All of the rejections are traversed. It is respectfully submitted that first the motivation to combine the teachings of Kulakowski, et al. with those of Birch, et al. is insufficiently motivated. Second, even in view of the suggested combination, that combination fails to meet the present claims.

First, as to the insufficient motivation to combine the two references, Kulakowski, et al. does not deal at all with video or with MPEG but instead deals with compression of ordinary computer data. Hence it is not seen where the Examiner motivates his combination of Kulakowski with Birch, et al. Apparently the suggested motivation, is according to the Examiner, "to provide flexible data compression-decompression controls that enable randomly accessing compressed data through relatively simple accessing mechanisms." However, it is not seen where motivation for this combination is provided in either of the cited references, or in another reference, or as being well known in the art. It is a matter of law that in order to establish a prima facie obviousness rejection combining two references, there must be motivation provided to do so. The Examiner only provides the most general of motivation, e.g., "flexible data compression-decompression controls ...". This appears to suggest merely that flexibility is desired in compression. The "flexibility" motivation, however, does not seem to be bottomed in either reference or in any other reference or in any particular suggestion in the art. Therefore the motivation to combine the references is lacking and hence the rejection itself is unsupported and should be withdrawn.

However, even if the combination is taken as supported, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these two references fails to meet for instance either of Claims 1 or 8. Kulakowski, et al. discloses, see Fig. 14, two computer systems 240 and 241 each having essentially the same structure including the host processor and hardware and software decompression and compression. These two computers are linked as described by the Examiner. However, within either system there is no suggestion to partition the actual compression/decompression between two hardware processors. Instead, in each system the entire compression/decompression appears to reside, in terms of hardware, in the processors

253 and 272. Hence this reference merely shows linking of two computers. There is also no particular disclosure of how these systems interact in terms of the actual compression or decompression operations.

The other reference Birch, et al., as indicated by the Examiner's reliance on Kulakowski, et al., also itself does not show any partitioning of decompression between a host processor and a secondary processor. Instead it appears that the entire decompression operation in Birch et al. is undertaken by the video process decompressor 32. See Birch, et al. at column 13 line 11 disclosing "The video process decompressor 32 reduces compressed video data which is output to video interface 40."

The further functionality provided by the compression control processor 34 in Birch et al. relates to "user data," and "vertical blanking interval data." However, there is no suggestion that the compression control processor 34 actually undertakes any decompression on its own; instead Fig. 2 seems to disclose that the entire decompression, including any of the user data and VBI data, is undertaken by the video decompression processor 32 and this data is merely separated out after decompression to be passed to the video interface, separately from the ordinary video data.

In any case the user data and VBI data do not meet the claimed "system layer" in for instance present Claim 1 and Claim 8. There is no suggestion that the user data and VBI data disclosed by Birch, et al. is the same as the MPEG system layer or that it relates particularly thereto.

Hence, even the combination of the two references fails to meet either of Claims 1 or 8 since neither discloses either of the steps recited in Claim 1 or the corresponding structure recited in Claim 8. Hence each of Claims 1 and 8 distinguishes over the references and is allowable thereover.

Claims 2 and 9 were rejected citing the two main references further in view of Harney et al. Harney et al. does disclose a graphics processor 30 shown in his Fig. 1. However, there is no suggestion in Harney et al. to use this graphics processor for any decompression or compression activity. Instead the graphics processor as shown is used for providing RGB video data without any particular compression. Therefore, this is apparently merely a conventional use of a graphics processor. Hence, it is not seen where in either of the two main references or in Harney, et al. the elements recited in Claims 2 and 9 are found. Therefore rejection of Claims 2 and 9 is also traversed as lacking support in the cited references.

The other claims are dependent upon independent Claims 1 or 8 and hence distinguish over the references for at least the same reason as does the base claim.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all of pending Claims 1-15 distinguish over the references, and allowance of this case is requested. If the Examiner contemplates other action, he is requested to telephone the undersigned at 408/453-9200.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231,

on Oct. 7, 1997

Norman R. Klivans Oct 7/97  
Attorney for Applicant Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Norman R. Klivans  
Norman R. Klivans  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,003